

written questions as followup in the last session of Congress, and it was clear that Mr. Hogland's nomination could not pass the Senate. In fact, could not even pass the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It was essentially sent back to the administration at the end of the lame duck session. And I am, frankly, surprised that the President has renominated Mr. Hogland under the circumstances.

The problem continues to be, on the one hand, that the administration has not offered any meaningful explanation of the reasons for firing the last U.S. ambassador to Armenia, John Evans. We all know the reason why Mr. Evans was terminated. It is because he articulated the fact that the Armenia genocide occurred. Historically, the U.S. policy has been to, basically, announce and accept the fact that the tragic events of the Armenian genocide occurred. But when anyone within the administration actually calls it genocide, immediately they are seen as a bad actor, and consequences follow from that.

And Ambassador Evans came to the United States. He was out in California. He was involved one afternoon or evening in a discussion about the tragic events that occurred between 1915 and afterwards, and he used the term "genocide." It may sound like no big deal to anybody else, a historical fact that almost every government in the world recognizes, that the U.S. has historically acknowledged. But the very fact that he used that term incurred tremendous opposition from the Turkish Government. And from that day on, his days were numbered as the ambassador to Armenia, and eventually he was terminated and Mr. Hogland was nominated in his place.

Now, last session, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee considered Mr. Hogland's nomination. Mr. Hogland failed to adequately respond to the questions asked by the Senators and, I would add, this is on a bipartisan basis. This isn't a Democrat or Republican issue. This is on a bipartisan basis. The members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee asked him a number of questions and Mr. Hogland would not clarify the U.S. policies denial of the Armenian genocide. In many instances he did not respond to specific Senators' questions, and he diverted his answers by responding with what seemed like prepared talking points and went to extreme lengths to avoid using the term "genocide."

Additionally, in response to a written inquiry from Senator JOHN KERRY concerning Turkey's criminal prosecution of journalists for writing about the Armenian genocide, Mr. Hogland referred to these writings as allegations.

Now, let me say, the U.S. has historically taken a leadership role in preventing genocide and human rights. But the Bush administration continues to play word games by not calling evil by its proper name in this case. Instead, they refer to the mass killings of

1.5 million Armenians as tragic events. That term, Mr. Speaker, should not be substituted for genocide. The two words are simply not synonymous. There are historical documents that show that the genocide cannot be refuted. But somehow the Bush administration continues to ignore the truth in fear of offending the Turkish Government.

Now, again, I don't think that our Nation's response to genocide should be denigrated to a level acceptable to the Turkish Government. And it is about time that this administration started dictating a policy for Americans, not for a foreign government like Turkey. This lack of honesty, in my opinion, by the Bush administration is simply not acceptable. The American people and this Congress deserve a full and truthful account of the role of the Turkish Government in denying the Armenian genocide.

Now, let me just say one more thing before I conclude this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. There is no way, in my opinion, that Mr. Hogland is going to be confirmed because of his policy, because of the fact that he continues to articulate a policy of denial. And I fear, myself, that it would make no sense to send an ambassador from this country to Armenia who cannot articulate the genocide. So I simply ask that this nomination be opposed again in the Senate, and the Bush administration realize that it can't submit it, and that they simply withdraw the nomination.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PASSAGE OF H.R. 4

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I believe we have an obligation to ensure that our Nation's seniors have access to the world-class prescription drugs which have been developed to improve their quality of life and, in some cases, to save those lives. That is why I thought that the previous Congress did a disservice to our Nation's seniors when the flawed prescription drug benefit was created.

I want Medicare part D to work as well as possible for America's seniors, and that is why Congress needs to address the gap of drug coverage that occurs when a senior enters the so-called doughnut hole and does not get financial help.

I want Medicare part D to work as well as traditional Medicare, which does work well. I will soon reintroduce legislation to help those who have ex-

perienced the predicament of being stuck in the doughnut hole by increasing the types of expenses that are counted toward their total out-of-pocket costs. This will help seniors get through the doughnut hole.

Now, today, the House passed legislation to give seniors access to affordable medicines. I supported this legislation because I think we need to act to improve the drug benefit and ensure that our Nation's seniors are properly taken care of.

I am pleased that the legislation maintains the prohibition on formularies contained in the original 2003 drug benefit legislation. It seems to me that national formularies, to limit available medicines, would do more to undermine patient health than to lower costs and, therefore, should not be imposed.

I remain concerned that there is no such language concerning price controls. I don't think the government can effectively establish prices. The marketplace is the best place to set prices that will help ensure the continuing pipeline of lifesaving and life-improving drugs. Historically, price controls have proved to be an awkward, clumsy way to allocate goods and services under ordinary circumstances.

But I want to talk for a moment about the great research that is being done at a number of different pharmaceutical companies in my district, in my State and across America. Research and development is the lifeblood of America's economic growth. Let me repeat: research and development is the lifeblood of America's economic growth.

I am proud to be the founder and co-chair with the gentlelady from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) of the Congressional Research Service and Development Caucus.

Now, every time this House acts, we should make sure that we protect the vibrant, path-breaking research that is occurring in the United States.

Now, there is a reason that we had a debate today on the prescription drug bill. We had the debate and the vote on this because the pharmaceutical research has been extraordinarily effective. Pharmaceutical companies have produced medicines that are not only very good for keeping people alive, improving their lives and reducing suffering, but medicines that were even inconceivable a decade or two ago. These medicines are truly a matter of life and death, and we would not be having this debate, but for the success of the pharmaceutical companies.

I don't want today's debate to leave anyone with the impression that this body wants to demonize the industry and make them stop doing their lifesaving work. None of the drugs we hear about were created overnight. They took years of effort by thousands of talented researchers and scientists. Starting with maybe half a million chemical compounds after years of basic research, a company might end